

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 095

SP 006 187

TITLE The 1971 Spring Conference Report of the Ford Training and Placement Program.

INSTITUTION Chicago Univ., Ill. Ford Training and Placement Program.

SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.

PUB DATE Dec 71

NOTE 29p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Conference Reports; *Educational Administration; Educational Research; *Professional Education; *Program Planning; Race; Teacher Education; *Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the highlights of the general and special sessions of the spring 1971 annual conference of the Ford Training and Placement Program. Funded by the Ford Foundation, this program is a coordinated effort by The University of Chicago and the Chicago Board of Education to develop better procedures for training professional staff for urban schools. Following an introduction and overview, this report covers 13 issues. These areas include goals of research and evaluation, organization and program administration, race, flexibility of the Ford Training and Placement Program Model, cadre personnel placement problems, cooperation, faculty integration, societal and professional functions, community inputs, analysis and evaluation, problems of urban education, issues and perspectives, and resource materials. (MJM)

tpp conference reporter

FORD TRAINING AND PLACEMENT PROGRAM/A SOCIAL SYSTEMS APPROACH FOR TRAINING URBAN TEACHERS/THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ED 073095



SPRING
CONFERENCE
REPORT
1971

ED 073095

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE 1971 SPRING CONFERENCE REPORT

of the

FORD TRAINING AND PLACEMENT PROGRAM

SP 006 181

FOREWORD

Because conferees are usually unable to attend all of the conference sessions in which they have an interest, and because intense interaction during individual sessions tends to focus conferees' attention on specific topics, interests, and problems, the overall conference highlights are often forgotten. It is therefore the intent of this report to refresh the memories of the conferees and to review for them some of the major sessions of the conference.

The three-day conference, consisting of six general sessions and fourteen interest group sessions, was interspersed with comments and presentations by distinguished personalities, professors, and public school officials. Full texts of speeches by special guests are available at the Ford Training and Placement Program office, 5835 South Kimbark Avenue, The Graduate School of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 60637. The interest group sessions dealt with current issues and problems incidental to implementing the cadre model in the public schools.

This report summarizes the highlights of both the general sessions and the special interest groups. We hope the information will refresh your memory and renew your interest in the program.

Henrietta S. Schwartz
Executive Director
Ford Training and Placement Program

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.	1
II. Overview.	4
III. Goals of Research and Evaluation.	5
IV. Organization and Administration of Program.	6
V. Race, The Major Urban Problem.	7
VI. Flexibility of the Ford Training and Placement Program Model.	8
VII. Cadre Personnel Placement Problems.	9
VIII. Co-operation, The Key to Entry.	10
IX. Faculty Integration.	12
X. Societal and Professional Functions.	13
XI. Community Inputs.	15
XII. Analysis and Evaluation Needed.	16
XIII. Problems of Urban Education.	16
XIV. Issues and Perspectives.	19
XV. Resource Materials.	22

INTRODUCTION

The Ford Training and Placement Program is entering its fourth year of operation. In the conception of the program, the school was seen as a social system. In this context, the effectiveness of universities' current methods of preparing teachers, counselors, and administrators for positions in inner-city schools was reviewed. The prevailing procedures for placing these personnel in inner-city schools were questioned.

It has been observed that the practice of preparing teachers along grade lines or along subject matter dimensions does not attend to the reality of the school as a social system composed of unique roles. The role of the inner-city teacher is not the same as the role of the suburban teacher, yet universities prepare teachers as if these roles were interchangeable. Further, the concept of the school as a social system suggests that roles in the school never function in isolation, but in complementary relationships to other roles. Yet the universities prepare teachers, counselors, and administrators in separate curriculums though, once in a school, they function in interconnected roles. Again, the concept of the school as a social system suggests that the greater the mutual understanding and good will among the various educational personnel, the greater the effectiveness and efficiency of the school. Finally, the conception of the school as a social system suggests that for the school to function properly there must be communication among the trainer (the university), the user (the school), and the client (the community). The Ford Program builds these bridges by forming cadres. The typical pre-service cadre or team is composed of new teachers (interns), experienced teachers, administrators, psychologists, so-

cial workers, community representatives, special service personnel, and Ford staff members. The cadre is the mechanism used to provide support for and increase communication among the participants. Through cross-role training, an intensive summer program, and the cadres' weekly and monthly meetings during the internship year, it is hoped that teachers and other professionals, both new and old, will benefit from an increased understanding of one another's roles; that problems central to the urban school will be identified and dealt with more effectively by a group than by an isolated individual; and that this in turn will lead to improvement in the quality of teaching and learning in urban areas.

The Ford Program is a complex one. Teachers and other personnel are trained in six different programs of the University: programs designed to prepare teachers for secondary schools, teachers for elementary schools, psychological specialists, adult educators, school social workers, and school administrators. For most of these persons a three-year sequence is involved: an initial year of training, an internship year as a member of a cadre, and a year of bona fide employment in Chicago schools.

Funded by the Ford Foundation, the Ford Training and Placement Program is a co-ordinated effort by The University of Chicago and the Chicago Board of Education to develop better procedures for training professional staff for urban schools. In addition to training these professionals and placing them in the city's inner-city schools, the program is designed to develop more effective and more relevant instructional programs and to build closely-knit school staffs which are trained to work co-operatively in implementing these programs. This impetus is resulting in new approaches to old problems through better

intra-professional relationships among school personnel, improved interpersonal relationships with other members of the school community, improved curriculum offerings, and a new set of relationships among the University, local school districts, and the communities they serve.

The program aims to improve education in urban schools by:

1. creating groups or cadres of educators made up of University interns and experienced professionals,
2. training the cadres to understand each others' jobs and to work together,
3. helping the cadres examine and understand the problems of education special to their particular school setting,
4. assisting individuals in the development of greater competence in their roles.

Urban schools include not only black ghetto schools, but also racially integrated schools, schools in areas of racial change, and schools serving any minority group. To reach these goals requires a staff racially integrated at all levels of the program.

Several institutions and many people are involved in implementing the Ford Training and Placement Program. This report summarizes the contributions of some of the organizations and individuals involved in the experiment.

Henrietta S. Schwartz
Executive Director
12/71

Dateline: Chicago, Illinois
December 1, 1971

THE 1971 SPRING CONFERENCE: AN OVERVIEW

The Second Annual Conference of the Ford Training and Placement Program Aims at Replication: The purposes of the meetings held on April 15, 16, and 17, 1971, at the Center for Continuing Education were to share the findings of the projects, to seek replication of all or parts of the Ford projects, and to establish lines of communication among educators who are interested in the productivity of urban schools.

Introduced by the Director, Henrietta Schwartz, the general theme of effective training and retraining of personnel for inner-city schools underscored all of the sessions and provided the framework to communicate the social system's model and cadre concepts to the conferees.

Discussions about the nature, development, and progress of the cadre began the program, which then turned to a consideration of the University's role in the Ford Program. Small group sessions were arranged to discuss in detail the preparation of classroom and non-classroom teachers for urban schools and the Ford Training and Placement Program.

The Board of Education's role in educational projects, specifically the Ford Program, began the second day's activities. Discussions focused on the co-operation necessary between the Board, the University, the schools, and the communities before any educational project can get underway and before interagency problems can be handled.

The importance of the non-classroom professional formed the focus of afternoon sessions when the notion of the school as a societal and professional center was proposed. Interest groups continued the discus-

sion with topics such as the importance of the community's input, the reading specialist's role, and the effect of non-classroom personnel on administrators.

Emphasizing the initial aim of replication in the conference, the final day's discussion centered around more detailed presentations of research, staff development, and budgeting. After discussions within interest groups organized on these topics, conferees returned to the general session during which the Ford Program and the conference activities were summarized and related to the general theme of effective training and retraining of personnel for inner-city schools in a time of urban school crisis.

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION SETS 1971-1972 GOALS

"The history of task accomplishment in the Ford Training and Placement Program does not permit a claim to unqualified success. At the same time, program development has moved toward a more responsive model in implementing relationships among actors in the program," said Wayne J. Doyle, Director of Research and Evaluation, while addressing the topic, "What Kind of Research Can Be Done".

Historically, research and evaluation has had four major thrusts:

1. analysis and clarification of program intent,
2. analysis of training experiences designed to develop competence for effective functioning in an inner-city school,
3. analysis of procedures for implementation of relationships among the functionaries within and between program components,
4. analysis of social benefits resulting from the Ford approach to training and placing professionals together.

For research and evaluation, the 1971-1972 academic year will embrace an analysis of teacher and pupil beliefs, attitudes, and behavior

in the classroom as one effort in assessing the impact of the Ford Training model on teacher behavior in the classroom.

ELEMENTS OF THE PROGRAM DEFINED; ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATION EXPLICATED

The Ford Training and Placement Program has a committee structure which assists in the policy and operation of the program, explained James F. McCampbell, Assistant Director of the program, and Taylor Griffin, Community Liaison. The Committees include University of Chicago faculty, members of the Chicago Board of Education, and staff members. The Executive Committee sets policy for the program; the Coordinating Committee sets operational and fiscal patterns; the Cross-Role Committee devises methods for incorporating the role specialists into the cadre and the school; the Curriculum Committee assists cadre members in subject matter development.

There are two very important roles filled by staff members in each cadre--those of the liaison and the consultant. It is the liaison who shares the concerns of the cadre and the staff with the total program, who may take the initial leadership role in the group, who assists the group members in their effort to solidify themselves, and who acts as the go-between for the program and the cadre. It is the group process consultant who assists the group in its efforts toward better communication, problem-solving, and decision-making; who emphasizes the inconsistencies which the group displays while attempting to address a problem; and who focuses on how a decision was reached or an issue raised.

The community liaison and the non-participant observer, both staff members, also assist the cadres. The community liaison's main function is to select several candidates from the community who would like to

participate in the cadre, and to provide them with the resources they need to function as full cadre members. The non-participant observer, a member of the research and evaluation staff, observes and records in written form the development of the cadre. It is the combined effort of all staff members and committees which leads to success with the cadres.

RACE, THE MAJOR PROBLEM OF URBAN EDUCATION, CONFEREES TOLD

The traditional and intellectual approach of the university is inadequate in dealing with the urban school crisis, according to Edgar Epps, Marshall Field Professor in The Department of Education, University of Chicago. The effects of race are encountered in every stage of the educational process. Race affects the selection of personnel, students, and materials, and it affects the allocation of educational resources.

Speaking before a general session of the conference, Mr. Epps declared that the quality of the products of our educational system depends upon the value system in which the educational process takes place. Our universities are instruments and resources for training the teachers for urban schools. When universities reflect the values of the dominant society, the products of the universities are consonant and congruent with the value system even when it is racist.

Universities should be introspective, Mr. Epps maintained, looking into their own values and helping to solve the major problem in urban education. Teachers' and administrators' expectations are limiting factors for achievement of non-middle class children. Administrators should seek to initiate change so that teacher expectations will reflect positive rather than negative attitudes toward the non-middle class

child. Development of self-worth in the non-middle class child should be a goal of the teacher.

"The university is seen as part of the problem rather than part of the solution," Mr. Epps stated. "Universities perform two very important roles for urban schools. 1) They provide teachers, and 2) they provide research and expertise which can be used to improve the educational process." The university can be more effective in helping to solve the problems of urban schools by being more responsive to the goals, ideas, and values of minority peoples. It must produce teachers who are more humane and must involve members of the racial groups which it wants to help.

INNOVATION AND FLEXIBILITY IN TEACHER TRAINING RELATED TO FTEP MODEL

The University of Chicago traditionally has had an interest in elementary school teacher preparation from the point of view of experimentation and innovation, rather than of producing a supply of teachers for the elementary schools, according to Richard Hodges, Associate Professor in The Department and Graduate School of Education. Speaking to a group on the "Elementary Teacher", he stated that since 1900, when personalities such as Wayland Parker and John Dewey were involved in developing training models and thinking of theoretical approaches for the training of elementary teachers, the University has been innovative in its selection of models, students, and programs. For example, early in the history of the elementary program, a group of women who had children in school and who were interested in working in schools were invited to participate in a program of training. The program began for each individual at her own level--some women had masters' degrees, oth-

ers bachelors', none started in their freshman year. Backgrounds varied, but undergraduate work in liberal arts was common to all. Since they had not been exposed to traditional teacher training methods, a more theoretically innovative program was possible. This historical experience set the stage for the Ford Training and Placement Program approach to the teacher training model.

The teacher training model should provide flexibility, encouragement, and opportunity for the trainee to explore, examine, and redefine his own theories of education and classroom practices, emphasized Richard Krasno, Assistant Professor in The Graduate School of Education, and Director of the Elementary Teacher Education Program, while speaking before the same group. In view of his changing perceptions, the trainee should gain confidence and the authority to develop new theories and approaches. Mr. Krasno said that a professional model such as medicine uses is not adequate for innovation. The students' model should be adaptable to the individual differences of the people using the model. Flexibility which will encourage individual innovation should be built into the institutional program. Such an approach is central to the Ford Training and Placement Program model.

PROBLEMS OF PLACEMENT CITED FOR CADRE PERSONNEL

Although the Board of Education is the joint developer of the cadre system of teacher training, some limitations due to the policies of the Chicago School System restrict its freedom to absorb the non-classroom educator, Curtis Melnick, Associate Superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools told the conferees. "For example, there is no certification process for adult education as such. Administrators of adult education

programs have been regularly assigned principals of Chicago high schools or elementary schools. Teachers of specified subjects in the standard adult education program have been certified in accordance with the same procedures effective for teachers in the regular kindergarten through twelfth grade program. Yet it has been possible to permit the adult educator for the Kenwood High School cadre to become the effective administrator for the adult education program during the second training year at that school," Mr. Melnick stated.

The adult educator is typical of the non-classroom educator whose placement is difficult to achieve within the current structure of the Chicago Public School System. Mr. Melnick noted that resistance to change is characteristic of large bureaucracies, but even so the Chicago System has "bent" and "accommodated" its procedures and policies for teacher certification to accomplish desired goals of the Ford Training and Placement Program. "...There has been a symbiotic relationship between the Chicago Public Schools and The University of Chicago in carrying out the objectives of the Ford Training and Placement Program," he said. "This argues well for the future of education in the Chicago Public School System. The system looks forward to increasingly more effective co-operation with one of the great universities of the world, to the evident benefit of both."

CO-OPERATION, PREPARATION PRECEDE ENTRY OF CADRES INTO URBAN SCHOOLS

Effecting entry into urban schools begins immediately after a new school year begins--one year before a cadre will enter a school, explained Earl Davis, School Board Liaison, and John Sawyer, Dunbar Cadre Liaison, during the interest group session, "Working with the Board of

Education". The Director and the Assistant Director of the Ford Program contact the Area Associate Superintendent to identify prospective schools in which the cadres are to be formed and placed. When prospective schools have been identified, the District Superintendent is contacted in order to orient and brief him and to obtain his assessment of the principal, faculty, climate, and community of the prospective school or schools in his district. When conditions are favorable, and prior to the final selection of the schools, the principal of each school is approached and oriented with an explanation of the program, and is made aware that his school has been identified as a prospective school for the program. His reaction is assessed and his co-operation is sought in the event that his school is selected.

The principal of a selected school arranges a briefing session with his staff. The interaction which follows determines the advisability of proceeding with the selection of that particular school. Faculty agreement precedes community contact which also must be made prior to bringing the program to that school. When all elements--District Superintendent, principal, faculty, and community--agree that the program would benefit the school and the students, the nucleus of the cadre can begin to take form. Final assessment is made of the relationship of the principal to the school, and the rapport he has with the community, faculty, and students. When the rapport is positive and the decision to select that school is definite, final steps to form a cadre in the school are taken.

Arrangements with the Board of Education for placement of teachers who are trained in the program and for spaces into which to place non-classroom educators will have to be made. Procedures for this arrange-

ment may be obtained from the Director of Dissemination and Demonstration or the Executive Director of the program.

INTEGRATION OF FACULTY TAKES TWO APPROACHES

Byron Minor, a District Superintendent in the Chicago School System, and Earl Durham, Assistant Professor in the School of Social Service Administration at the University, outlined the subtle nature of racism in the urban schools and offered direct approaches to its solution. One approach included the infusion of a cadre into the established faculty. As Mr. Minor put it, "...One type of integration that I think I ought to give some passing thought to is the integration of a new cadre into a faculty. This isn't strictly racial, although very often it is incidentally racial. In the early days of the Ford Program, we had a cadre of eight interns, all of whom were white being integrated into an almost solidly black situation."

"One way in which the effects of racial differences were overcome was to pick counterparts on the faculty who were black and who varied by sex, age, and philosophy, so that the incoming interns had an opportunity to work with people who did not possess precisely the same basic ideas." Mr. Minor continued, "We have Mrs. Kaffie Weaver with us today who was one of the cadre component of experienced black teachers. She was picked because she was young. That was not the only criterion. Of course the experienced people of the cadre were picked for their interest in the idea of participating in the program."

"An attempt was made to have variation in the cadre so that there would be almost a guaranteed lively exchange of ideas throughout the life of the cadre. I think this was quite important," Mr. Minor de-

clared. "It did give the interns in the cadre experience with black educators who exhibited a range of opinions. The white intern members of the cadre had a particularly challenging experience to undergo because they were at DuSable High School the year of the Martin Luther King assassination and other events which made the racial climate very tenuous. I think, all things considered, there was a pretty high degree of survival in that cadre."

SOCIETAL AND PROFESSIONAL FUNCTIONS SEEN FOR EDUCATION

A demonstration half-way house has been developed informally in Philadelphia to translate new curricular ideas and educational approaches for implementation in inner-city schools, Bruce McPherson, Superintendent of Schools in Ann Arbor, Michigan, told a general session of the conference. In a presentation entitled, "The School as a Societal and Professional Center",¹ he advocated the notion of the half-way house, described earlier by Professor Jacob W. Getzels of The Department of Education, University of Chicago. Mr. McPherson said that, after the establishment of the demonstration half-way house, curriculum decisions were more frequently being made at the local level.

The half-way house concept is built on communication and collaboration, Mr. McPherson declared. The role of the university should be a junior role in any program involving the school and the community. The university should function on terms set by the school-community and involve people in the basic issues which are necessary to the functioning

1

R. Bruce McPherson, "Summary of: The School as a Societal and Professional Center," (Chicago: April 16, 1971). Full text of speech available from the Ford Training and Placement Program.

of the school.

Mr. McPherson suggested that two myths in educational circles have prevented careful investigation of what is really wrong with our schools. The first myth is that money is the answer to all problems. The notion behind this fallacy is that educators really do know how to solve the problems of public education but they do not have the money to implement their solutions. The second myth is that the principal has no autonomy in the local school and, therefore, programs that he might wish to institute are immediately hamstrung. Mr. McPherson felt that both of these fallacies are in fact excuses to avoid changing the system.

In summary, he outlined some basic notions which should govern the training and activities of professional educators.

1. Most Americans have a wish to avoid conflict. However, what educators have to understand is that conflict is rational, inevitable, necessary, and very often is the catalyst for movement toward a particular goal.
2. Educators must respect the particular nature of each institution with which they come in contact. They must also recognize that their job, their function, and their success in their role is dependent upon the kind of co-operation that they can create among the institutions that impinge upon the school.
3. Educators must seek out the leadership in each of the institutions which relate to the school and work with that leadership to accomplish educational goals.
4. Educators should not avoid structures. Often formal structures that are equitable help in initiating new programs and in making appropriate changes.
5. Educators should seek to involve people from all roles in the institution in their planning and implementing of educational programs.

If these principles are observed, Mr. McPherson indicated that there would be reward for the school, the opportunity for change; reward for the student, a better education; reward for the parent, a chance to

influence the processes and programs of the school; and reward for the universities, an opportunity for better training and research.

BROADENED COMMUNITY INPUT SOUGHT FOR FORD PROGRAMS

The community representative's role involves defining student needs, evaluating the productivity of the cadre, and exploring solutions to problems pertaining to the schools' function, according to community representatives in the Ford Program. In the interest group which considered the "Community's Input for the School System", community representatives and staff of the program discussed the definition which had evolved for a community representative's role.

Each representative performs differently in each cadre. The vocational schools require participation from the industrial and parental community. Their joint function is to apprise the cadre of the expectations, needs, and concerns of both communities. The elementary cadre representative assists the group in developing reading programs and activities for the school.

Inequities of community participation within the Ford Program's structure inhibit optimum community participation, representatives emphasized. Although the program professes a positive relationship with the local school community, the Ford Program does not have community representation on the policy and decision-making body of its structure (the Executive Committee). There are obvious inputs community members could deliver; however, their inclusion on the Ford Executive Committee has never been activated. Their representation has been at the local school cadre level.

CONSTANT ANALYSIS, EVALUATION ESSENTIAL IN TRAINING TEACHERS TO DEAL WITH URBAN SCHOOL CRISIS

"What are we educating students for?" is one of the questions to be answered by educators if the universities are to be effective in training teachers to deal with the urban school crisis, Theodore Wright, Community and Human Relations Co-ordinator for the Chicago Public Schools, told the final session of the conference. In today's urban university setting, ambiguity is implied when the question, "What are we educating students for?" is raised. Wright said that the dilemma is intensified when more than one person or group in a university have an idea of what needs to be done and then proceed in different directions. Crises in the university are precipitated when the ambiguity is unresolved.

Universities will resolve the dilemma caused by ambiguity only when they perform a continual self-analysis and evaluation while participating in a teacher training program, emphasized Mr. Wright. He cited his own dilemma in appearing on the program as an example of a personal crisis analogous to the university crisis. He dealt with this crisis by trying to examine his adequacy to handle his material and to conform to a time schedule.

BROADER PROBLEMS OF URBAN EDUCATION SEEN AS FOCUS OF CONFERENCE

Some of the difficulties which have been alluded to in conjunction with the Ford Program are the result of the fact that we are simultaneously pursuing more than one goal, Arthur E. Wise, Associate Dean of The Graduate School of Education, University of Chicago, told the final session of the conference. While we are creating and testing a model of education and placement, we do not have all the knowledge that we should

have in order to most efficaciously provide educational experiences to our students, he said. He saw no better alternative, however, since the conduct of the project was in fact providing knowledge of both the model and urban education. He felt that some of the difficulties in the conduct of the project and in the experiences of individual participants therefore could have been anticipated.

"One of the essential ingredients for the focused preparation of people for work in inner-city schools is a sound knowledge-base about teaching in the inner-city," Mr. Wise emphasized as he considered the elements of the project and the assumptions upon which it is based. He continued, "I submit that we do not yet have a firm base of knowledge for teaching and learning in the inner-city." He suggested that we may, perhaps, discover that we don't have a very firm base for teaching and learning anywhere. We have ways of thinking about education; we have found more or less successful ways of teaching; and we think we know about some of the relationships between teaching and learning. But, increasingly, we are coming to question the kind of education which we believe we have been able to provide well--education for middle class children. The Coleman Report and other studies have raised questions about just how effective schools are.

With respect to the co-ordinated preparation of personnel for the schools, Mr. Wise felt that we are on somewhat firmer ground. There is a long tradition of research and conceptualization on social systems theory, on role analysis, and, consequently, we are having less difficulty.

"With the formation and placement of cadres we are on a somewhat firmer base because we know more about social structure than we know

about education," Mr. Wise declared. "It is very easy to misconstrue the purposes of this project. It is certainly not designed to be a panacea for the problems of urban education. Indeed, some of the concepts are equally relevant to all kinds of education. But, it is really a very modest proposal we are talking about--a new system for training and placing groups of people in schools. That is the fundamental innovation that we are talking about and that is the objective against which we must evaluate the success or failure of this project."

"The success of the project will become clear when cadres begin to take hold in their schools as they have," Mr. Wise said. "We have talked about some of the ways which this has happened at DuSable and Forrestville, for example. We will know about such success as cadres come to work together, breaking down the apparently natural resistance on the part of teachers to co-operating with one another. But it is that which we have to bear in mind. The program is simply a reorganization of the way in which we carry on our training and placement functions."

"It is appropriate that we consider the broader problems of urban education," he emphasized. "Many of these problems will be dealt with by the cadres as they come to gain a sense of confidence as individuals and as a collectivity." Mr. Wise expressed a frustration that comes about at conferences like this because of experimenting and rearranging the organization of schools without coming to grips with some of the issues related to teaching and learning in inner-cities.

In closing, Mr. Wise offered several pairs of concepts from the early 60's and 70's related to such issues, and asked conferees to think about why changes in these concepts had come about. He continued, "In

the early sixties we were talking about metropolitanism as a solution to many of education's problems. One doesn't hear that very much anymore. In its' place we hear about community control. We heard more about integration in the early sixties than we hear about it now. Now we talk somewhat more about separation. At one time we talked about the essential sameness of all children. Now we stress the essential differences among children. At one time we talked about having the same expectations for all children. Now we talk about having different expectations for different kinds of children. At one time we were convinced that ghetto schools were bad. And, now we are becoming convinced that all schools are bad."

ISSUES AND PERSPECTIVES

This summary of conference activities reflects several issues raised at the meetings. Three of them relate to areas of continuing program concern and planning.

First, Bruce McPherson spoke of the impact of new programs on the social systems of schools. An experimental program should produce a level of creative tension which serves as a catalyst for productive changes in the life of a school. Though the emphasis of the Ford Program is the training of educational professionals, one measure of the success of the training program should be the ability of the group to function as a positive change agent in the school. In six of the nine cadres this criterion has been met. These cadres have introduced ongoing staff development activities, new school community structures, intensive instructional programs in a variety of curricular areas; upgraded student achievement scores; etc. The changes have sometimes been

painful for the institutions and individuals involved, but the groups have survived and expanded their membership and activities. Research and evaluation has documented the processes by which the groups moved toward their objectives and what program staff contributed to assist the cadres' development. The information is available for those who wish to replicate all or parts of the program.

Second, a series of external constraints, teacher surplus, financial limitations, racial integration, and declining school populations, created a lack of placement opportunities for the new teachers and role specialists in our cadres. Once trainees had completed their internship year, the Chicago Public School System found it difficult to place all of them in the schools where they were trained. In anticipation of these external circumstances, the program developed the experienced teacher intern role, in which a teacher works half-time at the cadre school and is a masters' degree student at the University half-time. The model is a variation on the original theme, but is completely consistent with the assumptions regarding the school as a social system, cross-role training, and the promotion of collegiality to foster support and meaningful communication among school, community, and university.

Third, the conceptual model upon which the program is based has demonstrated again and again its flexibility and elegance in providing the direction for program self-correction and thrust. This theoretical framework has allowed staff to analyze problems and their consequences rather reacting to a series of crises. As a very wise man once said, "There is nothing so practical as a sound theory." The Ford Training and Placement Program is an excellent developmental example of this adage.

As the program approaches its last operational year, the emphasis will be placed on dissemination and demonstration. Staff members will be explaining the program to a wide variety of educators at national conferences, meetings, workshops, etc.

RESOURCE MATERIALS

The following is a list of resource materials compiled by the Ford Training and Placement Program during the last three years of operation.

If you would like to receive any of these documents, please contact:

Thomas F. Brady
Director of Dissemination and Demonstration
Ford Training and Placement Program
5835 South Kimbark Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

1. Original agreement with the Board of Education.
2. Resource Papers, a compilation of documents written by Ford participants.
3. Post-Conference Report, a review of the activities at the April, 1970, conference.
4. Reprint of J.W. Getzels' article, "Education for the Inner-City: A Practical Proposal by an Impractical Theorist".
5. A long program description.
6. Progress reports to the Ford Foundation, June, 1969; November, 1969; November, 1970.
7. Professional 3-Fold, a brief description of the Ford Program.
8. Bridge Over Troubled Waters, a tape and slide presentation, 30 minutes, color slides and a stereo tape.
9. Videotapes:
 - a. Cadre meetings, 60 minutes, black and white, 1/2" Sony.
 - b. Discussions of the Ford Program, 30 minutes each, 2 University of Chicago Roundtable: ABC program (Chicago), 1" Sony or Ampex, color.
10. Curriculum materials developed by the cadres:
 - a. DuSable High School: Black Literature, Basic and Essential Mathematics, Staff Development Proposal.
 - b. Forrestville High School: Teaching Reading Through Filmmaking, Art Curriculum, Experimental Science, Math Program.
 - c. Mann Elementary School: Steering Committee By-Laws, Parent-Teacher Handbook.
 - d. Kenwood High School: Social Studies Project.
 - e. Hyde Park High School: Special Reading Project.

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

The following is a list of documents compiled by Research and Evaluation which are available upon written request. Please contact:

Wayne Doyle
Director of Research and Evaluation
Ford Training and Placement Program
5835 South Kimbark Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Papers and Reports, 1969-1970

1. Evaluation of the Summer Program of Training.
2. The Summary Logs: Horace Mann Cadre (Summer Program).
3. A Report of Activity on the Hyde Park Cadre (Summer Program).
4. DuSable Report of Summer Program.
5. The Function of Research and Evaluation in the FTTP.
6. Analysis of a Social System: A Study in Power.
7. Report on Interviews with Forrestville Cadre.
8. Report on Interviews with Hyde Park Cadre.
9. Report on Interviews with Horace Mann Cadre.
10. Observations of the Forrestville Cadre After a Year.
11. Hyde Park Cadre as a Social System.
12. A History of the Ford Training and Placement Program (Phase I).
13. Some Impressions of the Cadre's Effect in School Settings: An Interim Report.
14. Methodology: A Crucial Issue for Research and Evaluation in Experimental Programs.
15. Hyde Park Reading Project.
16. Evaluation of the Pre-School Orientation for Faculty, Staff, and Volunteers (Horace Mann School).
17. The Group Development of the Horace Mann Cadre.

18. Faculty Perceptions of the Ford Cadre (Horace Mann).
19. The Horace Mann Reading Project.

Papers and Reports, 1970-1971

1. Ford Training and Placement Program: A Program for Training and Placement of Professional Personnel in Inner-City Schools.
2. Toward a New Basis for Authority in Teacher Training Programs: The Ford Training and Placement Program.
3. Some Major Impressions and Their Implications.
4. Evaluation of the Summer Program, 1970: Perceptions of Program Participants.
5. An Analysis of Weekly Logs (Summer Program).
6. The Simeon Cadre in Formation (Summer, 1970).
7. A Summer Perspective on the Development of the Cornell Cadre.
8. The Dunbar Cadre as a Social System.
9. The Simeon Cadre as a Social System.
10. The Cornell Cadre as a Social System.
11. Some Impressions of the Cadre's Effect in School Settings.
12. Proposal: Art Curriculum in Development (Forrestville).
13. Reading Through Filmmaking (Forrestville).
14. A Report on the Anthropology Unit (Kenwood).
15. Use of Movies in Guidance (Kenwood).
16. Community Involvement--The Parlor Meeting Program (Kenwood).
17.
 - a. Proposal for a Project Centering on Staff Development and Teacher Training.
 - b. Evaluation of Summer Portion of a Staff Development and Teacher Training Program (DuSable).
18. Report on Field Trips to Palos Park Reserve (Forrestville).
19. The Science of Photography: A Unit for Ninth Grade Students in an Inner-City School (Forrestville).
20. The Mathematics Program at Forrestville.

21. Horace Mann Cadre Proposal.
22. Phase II of a History of the Ford Training and Placement Program.

Full texts of speeches delivered at the conference are available upon request from the Ford Training and Placement Program office, 5835 South Kimbark Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, 60637.

The FPHP Conference Reporter was produced by the staff of the Ford Training and Placement Program with the assistance of the Editor of Education at Chicago and special clerical personnel. Copies are available at the FPHP office, 5835 South Kimbark Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, 60637.

Production Staff: Henrietta S. Schwartz--Executive Director, James F. McCampbell--Assistant Director, Wayne J. Doyle--Director of Research and Evaluation, Thomas F. Brady--Director of Dissemination and Demonstration, Barbara Turner--Editor of Education at Chicago, Andrena Drieske--Transcriber, Jonelle Kaiser--Typist.